COURT OF APPEALS
DIVISION II

2016 OCT 10 AM 10: 10
STATE OF WASHINGTON

No. 48744-6-II

Court of Appeals, Div. II of the State of Washington DEPUTY

Steve Berschauer, Appellant,

v.

State of Washington, Department of Enterprise Services, et al, Respondents.

### (SUBSTITUTE) BRIEF OF RESPONDENT CITY OF OLYMPIA

W. Dale Kamerrer Attorney for Respondent City of Olympia

Law, Lyman, Daniel, Kamerrer & Bogdanovich, P.S.
P.O. Box 11880
Olympia, WA 98508
(360) 754-3480
WSBA No. 8218

Mark Barber
Attorney for Respondent City of Olympia
P.O. Box 1967/601 - 4<sup>th</sup> Ave. E.
Olympia, WA 98507-8338
(360) 753-8338
WSBA No. 8379

### TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. Introduction.
II. Statement of the Issues
III. Statement of the Case.
IV. Argument.
A. Violation of the Statute of Limitations Precludes this Action.
B. Berschauer's Three Arguments Against the Time Bar of the LUPA Statute of Limitations Lack Merit9
1. The City's BLA Decision is not "Void" and in any Event the LUPA Statute of Limitations Applies to "Void" LUPA Decisions.
2. Berschauer's Argument that the Statute of Limitation Never Began to Run Lacks Merit13
3. Berschauer's Argument that He Commenced His Appeal Within the 21 days of the LUPA Statute of Limitations Is Without Merit
B. Alternative Remedies Exist, Precluding Declaratory Relief
V. Conclusion

### TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases
Asche v. Bloomquist, 132 Wn.App. 784, 133 P.3d 475 (2006)
Bilanko v. Barclay Court Owners Ass'n, 185 Wn.2d 443 (2016) 9, 10, 12
Chelan County v. Nykreim, 146 Wn.2d 904, 52 P.3d 1 (2002) 6, 8, 12
Citizens For A Safe Neighborhood v. City of Seattle, 67 Wn.App. 436, 836 P.2d 235 (1992)
Cox v. City of Lynnwood, 72 Wn.App.1, 7, 863 P.2d 578 (1993) 5
Durland v. San Juan County, 174 Wn.App. 1, 298 P.3d 757 (2012) 8
Evergreen Wash. Healthcare Frontier LLC v. Dep't of Social & Health Servs., 171 Wn.App. 431, 287 P.3d 40 (2012), review denied, 176 Wn.2d 1028 (2013)
Grandmaster Shen-Yen Lu v. King County, 110 Wn.App. 92, 38 P.3d 1040 (2002)
Habitat Watch v. Skagit County, 155 Wn.2d 397, 120 P.3d 56 (2005)
Island County v. Dillingham Development Co., 99 Wn.2d 215, 662 P.2d 32 (1983)
James v. Cty. of Kitsap, 154 Wn.2d 574, 115 P.3d 286 (2005)
Keep Watson Cutoff Rural v. Kittitas County, 145 Wn.App. 31, 184 P.3d 1278 (2008), review denied, 165 Wn.2d 1013, 199 P.3d 410 (2009)
Keller v. Bellingham, 92 Wn.2d 726, 600 P.2d 1276 (1979)
<i>Nakata v. Blue Bird, Inc.</i> , 146 Wn.App. 267, 191 P.3d 900 (2008)

Nollette v. Christianson, 115 Wn.2d 594, 800 P.2d 359 (1990)
Overhulse Neighborhood Ass'n v. Thurston County, 94 Wn.App. 593, 972 P.2d 470 (1999)
S. Tacoma Way, LLC v. State, 169 Wn.2d 118, 233 P.3d 871 (2010)
Samuel's Furniture, Inc. v. Dep't of Ecology, 147 Wn.2d 440, 54 P.3d 1194 (2002)
San Juan Fidalgo Holding Co. v. Skagit County, 87 Wn.App. 703, 943 P.2d 341 (1997)
Skamania County v. Columbia River Gorge Comm'n, 144 Wn.2d 30, 26 P.3d 241 (2001
State ex rel. Carroll v. Junker, 79 Wn.2d 12, 482 P.2d 775 (1971) 2
Trujillo v. Nw. Tr. Services, Inc., 183 Wn.2d 820, 355 P.3d 1100 (2015)17
Wash. Fed. of State Employees v. State, 107 Wn.App. 241, 26 P.3d 1003 (2001)2
Wenatchee Sportsmen Ass'n v. Chelan County, 141 Wn.2d 169 4 P.3d 123 (2000)
Witt v. Port of Olympia, 126 Wn.App. 752, 109 P.3d 489 (2005)

### Statutes

36.70C RCW	
43.21C RCW	
OMC 17.30	4
OMC 17.30.030	
OMC 17.30.030(5)	
OMC 17.30.040	9, 13
OMC 17.30.040(1)	14, 10
OMC 17.30.040(3)	16
RCW 36.70C.040	6 16
RCW 36.70C.040(2)	6 16
RCW 36.70C.040(2)-(4)	16
RCW 4.84.370	10
RCW 43.21C.110(1)(a)	5
RCW 58.17.040(6)	4 11
WAC 197-11-800(6)(f)	5
Rules	
CR 12(b)(6)	1 16
CR 12(c)	1, 10
CR 56	1

### I. Introduction.

The City of Olympia's involvement in the facts of this case was solely as the agency which received, processed and approved the State of Washington's application for a Boundary Line Adjustment (BLA) in 2011. The City's interest is in having BLAs accorded finality in conformity with the policy of law which favors conclusiveness in land use decisions.

Without finality in the highly-regulated area of land development, land owners' confidence in the ability to use their land for productive purposes will be unduly diminished.

After Steve Berschauer filed this action on December 4, 2015, the City answered, and moved for dismissal on January 15, 2016, pursuant to CR 12(b)(6), and, alternatively, CR 12(c). Although Mr. Berschauer submitted evidentiary documents in response to the City's motion, the trial court declined to consider the motion under CR 56, and granted the motion as requested. CP 61.

A court's dismissal of a request for declaratory relief is, unlike typical motions to dismiss or for summary judgment, reviewed for abuse of discretion. *State ex rel. Carroll v. Junker*, 79 Wn.2d 12, 26, 482 P.2d 775 (1971); *Grandmaster Shen-Yen Lu v. King County*, 110 Wn.App. 92, at 99, 38 P.3d 1040 (2002); *Wash. Fed. of State Employees v. State*, 107 Wn.App. 241, 244, 26 P.3d 1003 (2001) (*quoting Nollette v. Christianson*, 115 Wn.2d 594, 599, 800 P.2d 359 (1990)). A trial court abuses its discretion only when its decision is manifestly unreasonable or based on untenable grounds. *Nollette v. Christianson*, 115 Wn.2d at 599.

### II. Statement of the Issues.

- A. Did the trial court err in dismissing the Complaint on the basis of the LUPA statute of limitations?
- B. Does the appellant have an adequate remedy which precludes this declaratory judgment action?

### III. Statement of the Case.

The City of Olympia accepts parts 3.2 and 3.3 of the Appellant's Statement of the Case, with the addition that Mr. Berschauer's claim of ownership of a strip of land by adverse possession was not a recorded interest which could have provided notice to the City in 2011 of Berschauer's later claim and adjudication of the claim. In fact, in part 5.2, p. 10, of the Brief of Appellant, Berschauer asserts that he himself did not "become aware" that he had a challenge to the BLA based on his unrecorded interest "until [the] Thurston County Superior Court issued a summary judgment order on November 20, 2015, confirming that Berschauer owned the south half of the vacated street by adverse possession." Because part 3.1 of the Appellant's Statement of the Case is irrelevant to this action and the City had no notice of the Appellant's claim to ownership by adverse possession, the City rejects part 3.1.

Mr. Berschauer's Complaint admits that City of Olympia BLA 11-0135 was granted to the State of Washington in 2011.

CP 6. As of the commencement of this action on December 5, 2015, more than 21 days had elapsed since any date in 2011.

IV. Argument.

Mr. Berschauer's Complaint for Declaratory Relief sought judgment declaring that City of Olympia BLA 11-0135 was "void ab initio" and should be rescinded. CP 7. But Berschauer's challenge violated a jurisdictional statute of limitations requirement, and he possesses an adequate remedy at law. Each of these defects precludes this action.

A BLA is a species of land use approval which allows the movement of legal lot lines but does not create additional lots or grant development approval. State statutes recognize BLAs as exceptions to the platting statutes, and leave their regulation to local jurisdictions. RCW 58.17.040(6); *Island County v. Dillingham Development Co.*, 99 Wn.2d 215, 223, 662 P.2d 32 (1983).

Municipalities are not required to perform inspections of land which is the subject of a BLA application, and they are not

required to hold hearings or provide notice to neighboring property owners in order to process and approve a BLA. BLAs are categorically exempt from the requirements of the State Environmental Policy Act, ch. 43.21C RCW. RCW 43.21C.110(1)(a) and WAC 197-11-800(6)(f). If a property owner submits a BLA application and complies with legal requirements, a BLA must be granted. *Cox v. City of Lynnwood*, 72 Wn.App.1, 7, 863 P.2d 578 (1993).

The City of Olympia's regulations over BLAs are minimal. CP 14 and 15 contain the sum total of those regulations, found in chapter 17.30 of the Olympia Municipal Code (OMC). No notice to neighboring property owners is necessary and no hearings are conducted to review a BLA application. The City is not obligated to inspect the property affected or to make inquiry into possible ownership interests such as unadjudicated claims based upon adverse possession.

### A. Violation of the Statute of Limitations Precludes this Action.

Boundary line adjustments are land use decisions, subject to the procedural provisions of the Land Use Petition Act (LUPA), ch. 36.70C RCW. *Chelan Cty. v. Nykreim*, 146 Wn.2d 904, 926-27, 52 P.3d 1 (2002), *accord, James v. Cty. of Kitsap*, 154 Wn.2d 574, 584, 115 P.3d 286 (2005). Among the provisions of LUPA is RCW 36.70C.040, establishing a 21-day statute of limitations for challenges to land use decisions.

RCW 36.70C.040(2) provides that "[a] land use petition is barred, and the court may not grant review, unless the petition is timely filed with the court and timely served." This means that the limitation is a jurisdictional requirement which, when violated, mandates dismissal of an action challenging a land use decision. *Keep Watson Cutoff Rural v. Kittitas*County, 145 Wn.App. 31, 37-38, 184 P.3d 1278 (2008), review denied, 165 Wn.2d 1013, 199 P.3d 410 (2009) (citing Witt v. Port of Olympia, 126 Wn.App. 752, 756, 109 P.3d 489 (2005);

Overhulse Neighborhood Ass'n v. Thurston County, 94
Wn.App. 593, 597, 972 P.2d 470 (1999); and San Juan Fidalgo
Holding Co. v. Skagit County, 87 Wn.App. 703, 943 P.2d 341
(1997)).

LUPA's "statute of limitations begins to run on the date a land use decision is issued," *Habitat Watch v. Skagit County*, 155 Wn.2d 397, at 408, 120 P.3d 56 (2005), and "even illegal decisions must be challenged in a timely, appropriate manner." *Habitat Watch*, 155 Wn.2d at 407. The statute of limitations applies even if a challenger lacks notice of the land use decision. *Habitat Watch*, 155 Wn.2d at 400-01; *accord*, *Asche v. Bloomquist*, 132 Wn.App. 784, at 798-99, 133 P.3d 475 (2006).

A principle that guides Washington courts in determining whether challenges to land use decisions are permissible is that land owners should be afforded certainty in government decisions concerning development of their property. An associated principle is that decisions are final unless they are

directly and timely appealed. Wenatchee Sportsmen Ass'n v. Chelan County, 141 Wn.2d 169, 4 P.3d 123 (2000); Skamania County v. Columbia River Gorge Comm'n, 144 Wn.2d 30, 26 P.3d 241 (2001); Chelan County v. Nykreim, 146 Wn.2d 904, 52 P.3d 1 (2002); Samuel's Furniture, Inc. v. Dep't of Ecology, 147 Wn.2d 440, 54 P.3d 1194 (2002).

Different forms of collateral attack on a non-appealed land use decision are impermissible. *Durland v. San Juan County*, 174 Wn.App. 1, 13-14, 298 P.3d 757 (2012). This is so because a land use decision that is not timely appealed becomes unassailably valid. *Id., citing Wenatchee Sportsmen Ass'n v. Chelan County*, 141 Wn.2d 169 at 181, n. 2, 4 P.3d 123 (2000) (writ of certiorari is an impermissible collateral attack on a land use decision).

This action was untimely under LUPA. The action was commenced on December 4, 2015, and Mr. Berschauer's Complaint (CP 6) states that the City entered the BLA decision "in late 2011." The action further represents a disallowed

collateral attack on a final and valid land use decision. The trial court properly granted the City of Olympia's motion to dismiss, and that decision should be affirmed.

- B. Berschauer's Three Arguments Against the Time Bar of the LUPA Statute of Limitations Lack Merit.
- 1. The City's BLA Decision is not "Void" and in any Event the LUPA Statute of Limitations Applies to "Void" LUPA Decisions.

Mr. Berschauer relies principally on an argument that the statute of limitations does not apply to the City's 2011 BLA decision because that decision was void *ab initio*, and not merely voidable.<sup>1</sup> He argues that the BLA was void because OMC 17.30.030(5) requires that the BLA map include signatures of all parties holding an interest in the lots being

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Generally, the legal difference between an act that is "voidable" or "void" is that the statute of limitations applies to the voidable act but not to the void act. *See Bilanko v. Barclay Court Owners Ass'n*, 185 Wn.2d 443, 450-52 (2016). However, as discussed below, that difference does not apply under LUPA, where the statute of limitations applies to acts that are void as well as voidable.

adjusted and Mr. Berschauer who held an unrecorded interest in one lot did not sign.

The law is clear that an act by a person or governmental entity that fails to comply with a statutory requirement in circumstances like those here is only voidable and not void ab initio. For example, in Bilanko v. Barclay Court Owners Ass'n, 185 Wn.2d 443, 450-52 (2016), the Court ruled that the alleged failure of a condominium owners association to comply with a statute requiring a certain percentage of the vote to amend a condominium declaration was only "voidable" and not "void ab initio." The Court indicated that absent a showing of fraud or serious offense to public policy, the failure to comply with a legal requirement is only voidable unless the law in question expressly declares that the failure voids the act. 185 Wn.2d at 451. Here there is no allegation of fraud on the part of the City or serious offense to public policy, and the Olympia Municipal Code does not expressly void BLA decisions that are ultimately found not to comply with all of the criteria.

Similarly, in *S. Tacoma Way, LLC v. State*, 169 Wn.2d 118, 129, 233 P.3d 871 (2010), the Court rejected the argument that the Washington Department of Transportation's sale of a parcel was void because the Department acted *ultra vires* in failing to give a statutory notice to abutting landowners to allow them to bid on the property before it sold. The Court reaffirmed its prior holding that "[a]n act of an officer which is within his realm of power, albeit imprudent or violative of a statutory directive, is not *ultra vires*." 169 Wn.2d at 122-23.

Mr. Berschauer makes no argument that the City was not authorized to accept an application for a BLA and rely on its facial representations of ownership to approve such an application. Nor would such an argument have any validity because BLAs are recognized in State law (RCW 58.17.040(6)), and obviously are the subject of local legislation in the Olympia Municipal Code. CP 14-15.

Moreover, even if the BLA decision were void, LUPA case law holds that when the allegedly void action is a land use

decision, it must be challenged within the statute of limitations under LUPA or it will be deemed valid. *Nykreim*, 146 Wn.2d at 925 (*quoting Wenatchee Sportsmen Ass'n v. Chelan County*, 141 Wn.2d 169, 180-82, 4 P.3d 123 (2000)). "[E]ven illegal decisions must be challenged in a timely, appropriate manner." *Habitat Watch v. Skagit County*, 155 Wn.2d 397, at 407-08, 120 P.3d 56 (2005). The statute of limitations applies even if a challenger lacks notice of the land use decision. *Habitat Watch*, 155 Wn.2d at 400-01, *accord*, *Asche v. Bloomquist*, 132 Wn.App. 784, at 798-99, 133 P.3d 475 (2006).

Mr. Berschauer argues (Brief at 11) that the statements in Habitat Watch applying the LUPA statute of limitation to "void" acts (155 Wn.2d at 407-08) were implicitly overruled by Bilanko and S. Tacoma Way. However, no basis exists for inferring that Bilanko or S. Tacoma Way overruled the LUPA ruling in Habitat Watch, as neither case involved LUPA or even discussed Habitat Watch. Berschauer also argues that those statements in Habitat Watch were only dicta. Id. However,

the Court in *Habitat Watch* was clear that its ruling applied to permit decisions "within LUPA - even where the decision is allegedly void." 115 Wn.2d at 408. In *Habitat Watch*, the facts supported an alleged inference of serious offense to public policy because the County extended a permit twice without holding statutorily required public hearings or giving statutorily required notice to all parties of record. *Id*.

### 2. Berschauer's Argument that the Statute of Limitation Never Began to Run Lacks Merit.

Mr. Berschauer argues that the LUPA statute of limitations never began to to run because the City's BLA was never final since the State failed to satisfy the requirement of OMC §17.30.030(5), of a map signed by Berschauer.

Appellant Brief at 10. For this argument, Berschauer relies on OMC 17.30.040, which provides as follows:

Approval of the boundary line adjustment shall not be final until:

- 1. There is compliance with the requirements above;
- 2. The county treasurer has certified that all taxes on the land have been fully paid and discharged; and

3. A final map including any record of survey has been approved by the Department and filed for record with Thurston County Auditor.

Under Mr. Berschauer's reading of Section .040(1), no decision of the City on a BLA would ever be final if at any time in the future a person could have the BLA declared invalid because one of the seven requirements for a BLA in OMC .17.30.030 had not been met. His reading leads to clearly absurd consequences in that a BLA that people have relied upon to make land conveyances for decades would be open to attack without any time bar. That would undermine the desired goal of reasonable certainty for land use determinations that is the bedrock of LUPA.

Further, Berschauer's reading of Section .040(1) is contrary to the City's reasonable interpretation of the provision, which is that "compliance with the requirements above" means that the City was reasonably satisfied that those requirements had been met as evidenced by its approval of the BLA. Since the City is the entity with expertise in land use regulation and

has historically applied .040 in this manner, its interpretation, unlike Berschauer's absurd interpretation, should be given deference. *Citizens For A Safe Neighborhood v. City of Seattle*, 67 Wn.App. 436, 440, 836 P.2d 235 (1992) "It is a well established rule of statutory construction that considerable judicial deference should be given to the construction of an ordinance by those officials charged with its enforcement.") (quoting Keller v. Bellingham, 92 Wn.2d 726, 731, 600 P.2d 1276 (1979)).

3. Berschauer's Argument that He Commenced His Appeal Within the 21 days of the LUPA Statute of Limitations Is Without Merit.

As his third and final argument, Mr. Berschauer argues in the alternative that he met the LUPA 21 day statute of limitations because on December 4, 2015, he filed his superior court challenge to the BLA within 21 days of the date that the City's BLA decision was issued, which he alleges was November 20, 2015. Brief of Appellant at 10. He argues that the date the BLA decision was issued should be considered to

be November 20, 2015, because that is the date he first "became aware" he had a BLA challenge, since on that day the Thurston County Superior Court issued an interlocutory ruling that he owned the south half of the vacated right of way by adverse possession. Brief of Appellant at 10.

The date a decision is issued under LUPA is defined at RCW 36.70C.040(2)-(4). See Habitat Watch, 155 Wn.2d at 408. A land use decision is considered issued on the third day after it is mailed, or on the date that the local jurisdiction provides that notice is publically available. Id. If neither of those dates apply, the decision is considered issued on the date it is entered into the public record. Id. Here the record does not disclose a date of mailing. OMC 17.30.040(3) arguably provides for public notice by requiring recording, and in any event, the date of recording would be a date that the decision was "entered into the public record." The BLA was recorded

by the County Auditor on December 21, 2011.<sup>2</sup> Since Mr.

Berschauer's suit was filed on December 4, 2015, it clearly was more than 21 days after the decision was issued.

### B. Alternative Remedies Exist, Precluding Declaratory Relief.

Declaratory relief is not available when there is an adequate alternative remedy. *Grandmaster Shen-Yen Lu v. King County*, 110 Wn.App. 92, 98-99, 38 P.3d 1040 (2002). The party seeking declaratory relief must show the absence of an adequate alternative remedy. *Nakata v. Blue Bird, Inc.*, 146 Wn.App. 267, 279, 191 P.3d 900 (2008). Although declaratory relief is available if a court determines that other available remedies are unsatisfactory, this exceptional relief is rare.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> The recorded BLA is contained at CP 50-52. Because it is difficult if not impossible to read the date of recording on those pages, we have attached a readable copy as the Appendix to this brief. "Documents whose contents are alleged in a complaint but which are not physically attached to the pleading may ... be considered in ruling on a CR 12(b)(6) motion to dismiss." *Trujillo v. Nw. Tr. Services, Inc.*, 183 Wn.2d 820, 827, n. 2, 355 P.3d 1100 (2015). Further, where the "basic operative facts are undisputed and the core issue is one of law," the motion to dismiss need not be treated as a motion for summary judgment. *Id.* 

Sheng-Yen Lu, 110 Wn.App. at 106. Loss of an adequate remedy due to a party's failure to diligently pursue it does not allow the party to bring an action for declaratory relief.

Evergreen Wash. Healthcare Frontier LLC v. Dep't of Social & Health Servs., 171 Wn.App. 431, 452-53, 287 P.3d 40 (2012), review denied, 176 Wn.2d 1028 (2013).

Mr. Berschauer does have an adequate alternative remedy. Once his ownership by adverse possession is finally determined in the separate action under Thurston County Superior Court Cause No. 13–2-02519-9 (Court of Appeals No. 49414-I-II),<sup>3</sup> he can apply for a boundary line adjustment to reform the line between his property and the BLA-derived Parcel No. 4, where his claimed property interest lies.

This declaratory judgment action is not supported by evidence that no adequate alternative remedy exists, and, in

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> This action is arguably premature because Mr. Berschauer's adverse possession claim is not yet fully adjudicated (see Court of Appeals No. 49414-I-II).

fact, such a remedy does exist. For this additional reason, the superior court's order dismissing this action should be affirmed.

### V. Conclusion.

For the reasons given above, the Court of Appeals should affirm the decision dismissing Mr. Berschauer's Complaint for Declaratory Relief; and, if the City prevails on appeal, should award attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to RCW 4.84.370, on the basis that the City prevailed before the superior court and is considered a prevailing party because its decision will have been upheld at the superior court and on appeal.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED this 7th day of October, 2016.

LAW, LYMAN, DANIEL, KAMERRER & BOGDANOVICH, P.S.

W. Dale Kamerrer, WSBA #8218

Attorneys for Defendant City of Olympia

OFFICE OF THE OLYMPIA CITY ATTORNEY

Mark Barber, WSBA #8379

City Attorney for City of Olympia

### Appendix

圣 FOR

GRANTED

NUMBER: 11-0135-01

NO. 56 V 23, TOWNSHIP SWAN DLC NO. 41 / OFFUT DLC N
SW QUARTER OF THE WE QUARTER OF SECTION
18 NOSTH, RANGE 2 WEST, W.H.
THE CITY OF OLYMPIA, THURSTON COUNTY, W.

ASSESSOR'S PARCEL NO(S)
88350200102, 5440000000, 683000400100, 6830000000
809590011000, 69550000000, 5730000000, 69550000000
809590001000, 9955000000, 97350000000, 99550000000

SURVEYOR'S CERTIFICATE THIS MAP WAS MADE BY ME OR UNDER MY DIRECTION AND THAT THE DISTANCES AND COURSES SHOWN HEREON ARE CORRECT AND AT THE REQUEST OF:

STATE OF WASHINGTON, DEPARTMENT OF ENTERPE IN NOVEMBER, 2011, O 11/23/11

CERTIFICATION OF CONFORMANCE

I HEREBY CERTIFY THAT THIS BOUNDARY LINE ADJUSTMENT CONFORMS WITH THE REQUIREMENTS OF SECTION 17,30,030 OF THE OLYMPIA MUNICIPAL CODE. CITY OF OLYMPIA COMMUNITY PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT

12-21-11

### AUDITOR'S CERTIFICATE

PLED FOR RECORD THIS 21 DAY OF DEC. 2011 AT THE REQUEST OF CHAY OF GIVEN PIO. AUDITOR WAYNON SELLY SELLY NAMED

ORIGINAL TRACT OWNER NAME & ADDRESS

STATE OF WASHINGTON
DEPARTMENT OF ENTERPRISE SERVICES
P.O. BOX 41401
OLYMPIA, WA 98504—1015

252 PALPASTRAN COUNTY TREASURER 12/21/2011

Parametrix

247-4575-005 TOTAL DE JUTH AVENUE DE SUITE 100 PUTYALLIP, WASHINGTON 85274
T. 253,694,600 F. 253,604,679
WWA, DRENHALE COME. JOB NO.

1 OF 3 11/01/2011 TWO INCHES AT FULL SCAL IF NOT SCALE ACCORDINGL SCALE N/A DATE DESIGNED AWB/SAR DRAWN AWB/SAR CHECKED KDC

BOUNDARY LINE ADJUSTADIT IS NOT A GUARANTEE THAT FUTURE PERUITS WILL BE UCTURE OR DEVELOPMENT WITHIN A LOT AFFECTED BY A BOUNDARY LINE ADJUSTADE BOUNDARY LINE ADJUSTMENT IS NOT A PLAT, REPLAT, OR SUBDIVISION

BAY

INSURANCE DRICER NO. NCS-10444A-FAIT, DATED AUGUST 30, 2011 AT 7:30 AM, ORIGINAL LEGAL DESCRIPTIONS (PER PIEST MERIEN THE PISSENIE COMPANY COMMUNICATIVE THE RISJAM

ANDINE-CUPITOL APPROACH; HARD, R. D. COTTON, OF PHISOMY SHOWING M. PLUINE, I. OF PLUI PAIR, D. DUDTHN THERMOW IN ROAI-OF-MAY OF THE UTWER-14TH. NO DELET THE PORTINE TREETS TO THE CITT OF ULLIARY FOR FOUNDED TO FEED SCHOOL MAKER ACTION.

PARCE TO THE MENT OF MELS SERVICIAN OF USE 1, 2, 15 AND 16 IN ELOCK OF PHYRINGS SERVICING OF USE 9, 0,1 AND 17 IN ELOCK ST. ER. AND 63 OF SANCK AGMINN TO THE CITY OF COLUMN, AND RECEIVED, AN VOLUME OF THE CITY OF COLUMN, AND RECEIVED, AND RECEIVED AN VOLUMN, FOR THE MENT OF THE CITY OF COLUMN AND AND ADDRESS OF THE CITY OF COLUMN AND ADDRESS OF

13. C. Theorem is belock of physics of some than 12 and 20. C. I. And 12 and 15 country for the time in the control of physics of the control of physics of the recent and the control of physics of the recent and the control of the

LEGY TRRONG B.

WASHINGTON TO THE OWNER THE WASHINGTON TO THE OWNER THE OWNER AND THE OTH OF OWDER, NE RECORDED IN YOURE I OF PARKES, PACK
WASHINGTON COUNTRY TO THE OWNER THE WASHINGTON TO SHOW THE OWNER AND THE OWNER OWNER AND THE OWNER OWNER AND THE OWNER OWNER OWNER AND THE OWNER PASS

■ PROJECT SITE

THE THE LIST IS CHAIR COMMENDED OUR MESS, TERMINGON TO BE ARREST WAS DECOMED AS FOLLOWS. SHOWER, SHORE, SMICH, WALL THEREE DATE SAO FEET, THENCE STORTH THE THE SAME AS THE TOWN THE SAME AS THE TOWN THE SAME AS THE TOWN THE TOWN THE THE TOWN THE SAME AS THE TOWN THE TOWN THE TOWN THE SAME AS THE WAS THE TOWN THE SAME AS THE TOWN THE SAME AS THE SAME AS THE SAME AS THE TOWN THE SAME AS THE SAME

HERD, F. PRINCES, ARTHOLA, R. RECHORD BY WALLAE, J. C. P. PAUS, PAG. 7 DOCTHIN, THERSTOW, THE CHORDAND BY THE CUT OF COUNTY, FOR UNCOLN STREET, INFO KNOWN A. PRINCES, ADMINISTRY OF COUNTY, SPECIME COUNTY, LESS DECEMBER, HE LOST Z. THES OF LINES 4 AND ST SEAD PRINCES, SURVEY, AND ST SHOWN A. PROPERTY AND STREET, IS GANDED BY MAIN PROPERTY, SANDAND, THE COUNTY AND STREET, INC. SHOWN A. PROPERTY SET REED RECORDS, UNGERTY, FAND DECEMBER, ADMINISTRY, THE PROPERTY SET REED RECORDS, UNGERTY, THE PROPERTY COUNTY, AND DECEMBER, THE STREET SHOWN AND STREET, STREET, STREET, AND STREET, AND STREET, THE PROPERTY COUNTY, AND DECEMBER, THE PROPERTY OF THE PROPERTY SET RESPONDED. UNDER RECORDS, AND STREET, AN

PHRZI C. BHET PROMIT OF THE LIST IL GITH TOWARD CLAUR, N.S., THYSING HE STATES CHORD OF THE LIST IN CONTROL OF THE STATES OF THE THROUGH CHAIN AND OF THE STATES OF THE THROUGH CHAIN THROUGH CHAIN OF THE STATES OF THE THROUGH CHAIN OF THE STATES OF THE THROUGH CHAIN OF THE STATES OF

THE FORE THE WITHERST CHARTER OF SCENDA 2.1 TONGORD IN MACE, 1 WINT, # M. EGGRED A FOLLOW.

THAT THE SAM ALL SCHOOL SCHOO

PAGOL E An Egglen tre bigges, Erges, and Utilits as Described in and Disclosed by Tayr ( Hamer Azziga), in Thurston Colart, Washaton,

Carian document entiled "exement" — sewer and haiff " (co—os—1903)," and recogned under recognia

THE PRINCE OF STATES OF THE WORTER ORDING TO STORY IS THOUGH TO BE CONTROLLED TO BE CONTROL

NEW LEGAL DESCRIPTIONS

THE PRINCE OF SECURITY OF SECURITY OF SECURITY OF SECURITY SECURIT

HARTON, OF THE WORKEND QUERREY STATES, MANDETE WEIGHT, BUTCHE STATES, MALADITE WEIGHT, WITH THE WORKEND WEIGHT OF THE WORKEND QUERREY OF THE WORKEND QUERREY OF THE WORKEND WEIGHT OF THE WORKEND WEIG

G : 220gaq ent Invasivation val 1 veterous Me of 30 Interest of 200 Interest

CAPITOL

L A.K DATE OF STREET



HEEEHZH WH

(z)

VICINITY MAP SCALE 9 2/2

SWAN DLD NO. 41 / OFFUT DLC NO. 36
SW QUARTER OF FERTING 123, TOWNSHE
THE CITY OF DLYMPIC, THURSTON COUNTY, WISHINGTON

PARCEL INFORMATION

BOUNDARY LINE ADJUSTMENT

CITY OF OLYMPIA

NUMBER: 11-0135-0L

# RECORD OF SURVEY ~ BOUNDARY LINE ADJUSTMENT NO. 11-0135-OL

## DECLARATION OF BOUNDARY LINE ADJUSTMENT

KNOW ALL MEN BY THESE PRESENTS:

THAI WE, THE UNDERSIGNED, ARE THE OWNERS OF THE REAL PROPERTY DESCRIBED BY THE DECLARATION. AND ARE EXECUTED OF THE HERBY DESCRIBED ADJUSTMENT OF LAND WARMY OF THE HERBY DESCRIBED ADJUSTMENT OF LAND KNOWN AS BOTHOMRY LINE ADJUSTMENT VIMILIER 11-0135-OL.

1. WE, THE UNDERSIDAD HERBEY DEFEND, NOBLINEY, AND HOLD HARMLESS THE CITY OF OLYMPIA, ITS OFFICERS, AGENTS, AND BEAUCHTES THANK MAY MAY USE LOSTS OF DAMAGES, INCLUDING, BIT MOT LUMITED TO, ATTORNEYS, EES INCLURED AS A RESULT OF THIS SONNIORY NOT BEND. THE OWNER, OF THE WORDEN WELL OFFICE OF THE OWNER, DAMAGES INCLURE, BUT ARE NOT LIMITED TO, INTENTION, WOLLWIGHT OUR BUT THE, BOUNDARY DEPUTES, LOSS OF USE OF ALL OR A PORTION OF REAL PROPERTY

STATE OF WASHINGTON )

COUNTY OF THURSTON

2. WE, THE UNDERSIONED, HEREDY ACKNOWLEDGE THAT THIS BOLNIDARY LINE ADJUSTIVENT HAS BEEN MADE. WITH OUR FREE CONSENT AND IN ACCORDANCE WITH OUR DESIRES, 3. THE ATTACHED BOUNDARY LINE ADJUSTNENT MAP (PAGE THREE) AND LEGAL DESCRIPTIONS OF PARCELS (PAGE ONE) ARE MADE PART OF THIS DECLAPATION.

X ELLE LAST

岁 TITLE/AUTHORITY

GRANTOR

DATE TILE/AUTHORITY

bepore me, and said person acknowledged that (He/SHE) signed this intriment on cath stated that (He/SHE) was authorized to execute the instrument and acknowledged it as I CERTIFY THAT I KNOW OR HAVE SATIFACTORY EVIDENCE THAT 뿔 DATE

TO BE THE FREE AND VOLUNTARY ACT OF SUCH PARTY FOR THE USES AND PURPOSES MENTIONED IN THE INSTRUMENT.

SIGNATURE

NOTARY PUBLIC IN AND FOR THE STATE OF WASHINGTON RESIDING AT

MY APPOINTMENT EXPIRES

CITY OF OLYMPIA Approved For Recording

De Bert

I CERTIFY THAT I KNOW OR HAVE SATIFACTORY EVIDENCE THAT STATE OF WASHINGTON ) COUNTY OF THURSTON )

BEFORE ME, AND SAID PERSON ACKNOWLEGED THAT (HE/SHE) SIGNED THIS MIRUMENT, ON OATH STATED THAT (HE/SHE) WAS AUTHORIZED TO EXECUTE THE INSTRUMENT AND ACKNOWLEDGED IT AS IS THE PERSON WHO APPEARED 분

TO BE THE FREE AND VOLUNTARY ACT OF SUCH PARTY FOR THE USES AND PURPOSES MENTIONED IN THE INSTRUMENT.

to be the free and voluntary act of such party for the uses and purposes mentioned in the instrument.

OF DEPARTMENT OF ENTERPRISE SERVICES

THE DIRECTOR

BEPORE ME, AND SAID PERSON ACKNOWEDGED THAT (HE/SHE), SIGNED THIS NITRUMENT, ON OATH STATED THAT (HE/SHE) WAS AUTHORIZED TO EXECUTE THE INSTRUMENT AND ACKNOWLEDGED IT AS

I CERTIFY THAT I KNOW OR HAVE SATIFACTORY EVIDENCE THAT

SS

COUNTY OF THURSTON

STATE OF WASHINGTON )

JOUCE GARNETT TURNER

IS THE PERSON WHO APPEARED

SICHATURE

DATED

NOTARY PUBLIC IN AND FOR THE STATE OF MY APPOINTMENT EXPIRES WASHINGTON RESIDING AT

MY APPOINTMENT EXPIRES 11-22-11

NOTARY PUBLIC IN AND FOR THE STATE OF WASHINGTON RESIDING AT DIYM, PLA

SIGNATURE

DATED 11/21/2011

CITY OF OLYMPIA | PARCEL | ADDRESS | LDT 1 | 519 147H AVENUE SE | LOT 2 | BUILDING ADDRESS REAUN AS | 1500 JETERSON STREET SE 532 167H AVENUE SE
603 167H AVENUE SE
LOT 3 624 167H AVENUE SE
LOT 4 620 167H AVENUE SE ALL LOTS ARE:

STATE OF WASHINGTON ZPCODE OF 48501

IS THE PERSON WHO APPEARED



AWB/SAR TWO INCHES AT FULL SCAL CHECKED SCALE ACCORDING SCALE ACCORDING SCALE ACCORDING NATE NO APPROVED NATE JOB NO. 247-4575-001
DESIGNED O AWB/SAR DRAWN Parametrix

S OF 3

11/01/2011

DATE

4SSESH TH MAN THUISTON COUNTY WA

BLAM 4243334 3/3

SW QUARTER OF THE R. QUARTER OF SECTION 25, TOWNSHIP THE CITY OF OLYMPIA, THURSTON COUNTY, WASHINGTON 3 OF 3 SET 5/8" REBUR AND CUP IS \$41296 BOUNDARY LINE ADJUSTMENT NUMBER: 11-0135-0L J. THE CITY OF OLYNA'N, ATTORNET HAS DETENDINED THAT THERE ARE NO UNDER LYNS RIGHIS OR EXSOLENTS ENCLARERING THE AGINGAINHONED WANTED STREETS. O SET NAL AND WASHER US #11236 2) algament tor 19th arbue estreighed from estage frames of the 25 to ap 106.39, thousen rows to argue way, trussion count  $R/R \le 40$ . VACATED STREET NOTES.

\*\*DESTREET NOTES AND ADDRESS AN PAGENCINA SAVE CONTRINCE STICILA MUNICIFICAÇÃO; SOUTH ZINCE BESTO NA PRES TRIANCINO CONNYE BENCH WARK NO. 206 AT THE INTERSECTION OF SEFTERCHY NOT THE ACT AND RESON CONTRICA. FOURTH GENOS—7 = SOUTH YEAZINF DAY Taylor 3-0 Call Taylor 3-0 Cal SET SORBED X IN CONCRETE 1) A PORTON MENST, THE SENGETT TO A 1947 NO BALD' RESTRICTION AS RECORDID UNIVERSE, ALREICH CON BARGET, ASSON, CON LIUT I, SELOCA 4, OR PUTENTES STREAMEN, THE CONTRACT RESERVANCE TO THE CONTRACT THE OWN LUT GARRES THE CONTRACT RESERVANCE TO THE CONTRACT THE CONTRAC 2. ORGINAWICE NO. 3265, RECREDED UNDER RECORDING NO. 1028459. WALVED THAT PORTION OF PORMER 15TH ANDLIE LYMO WITHIN NEW PARCEL 4. PENDERSON OF THE SCALE S OLD TITLE COMPANY PARCEL DESCHAIGN PRICH TO THIS LOT CONSOLIATION (THANSTON COLMIY TITLE COMPANY ORDER NO\_LESSE) CITY OF OLYMPIA NEW PARCEL 1 NEW PARCE. DESIGNATION NEW PARCE, LINE MONONDAT LINE EASEMBNT LINE EXISTING BUILDING DATE 11/01/2011 UNE LEGEND TEXT LEGEND BASIS OF BEARING SYMBOL LEGEND FOUND MONIMENT AS HOTED FDUND MONUMENT AS HOTED JOB NO. 247-4575-OCT DOWNED LAND CLAIM CORNE **Parametrix** FOUND REBUR AS NOTED PARCEL A W21'00'5'V T-MBIDED PIGET SOUND BIRRSY EXEMBIT ARY 4225220 FND 5/8" REBAR WITH CAP SHELTON 26301 D.B. W. AND D.1 S. OF CALC'D POSTION. 401.42,54.1 585 32 NEW PARCEL 3 3 56,392 S.F. 0.84 ACRES AENSED PUGET SOUND-BRENCY EXSUBIT ARN 4725698 **NEW PARCEL 4** PARCEL D 39,221 S.F. 0.90 ACRES PARCEL G NON D.3" W. D.3" S. OF CALC'D POSTICIAL. 12,000 PARCEL 3 ACCESS EXEMENT 263.00 1813 1813 1808 1808 1808 OD LAE N3574756N N0145'24'E---RENSED PUGET SOUND-BRENT ENSMENT APM225220 Tunil CUP 'LS STEB' 0.9 OF SET CORNER THO (2) STORY METAL SHELL BUEDING PUGET SOUND POWER & LIGHT PARCEL 4 NOTA PART - 14TH AVENUE/15 CAPITOL ACCESS & 56.05 OPEN TO THE PUBLIC CHERRY STREET OLD LINE S670676T 4.17 — S01'45'24'W 2.60 — CHERRY STREET RID 2" BRUCS DISK IN LONDWENT CUSE HELD TO CONTROL THIS SURFEY. FND 5/6" PEBAR WITH CUP STROLETON 26301" 0.35 W. AND 1.15. OF CALCO POSITION. NEW PARCEL 1 625W AND DATE 26,647 S.F. TO SET THE NEW TO PER THE SET T (HELD DIG LINE FER CITY OF OLYMPIA RECORDS) PARCEL F 52524 NEW PARCEL 2 6.64 ACRES OLD LINE PARCEL C 58873111 OPEN TO THE PUBLIC ,50 14TH AVENUE SE UNCERCROUND TURNEL TO BASSMENT PARKING CARLOS PRD 3" BRASS DISK IR HUMUNEAT CASE, 0.09" E. OF CACULATED POSITION JOST UTLITY EASTHERN APA 4221551 PARCEL A UNLY EXENDIT SEE #1-HELD TO CONTROL THE SURVEY. PARCEL E DID LINE 10" PSE EASEMBNT APN 285572 -A ISOMA 6.85h 74.101 310,15 NOT 44'23'E 13TH AVENUE SE 3,22,51.104 FAD 1/4" BRASS PLUE IN CONC. IN MONULENT CASE — HELD TO CONTROL. THE SURPEY. 34 RID S/8" REBUR (NO CAP) 0.15" R. OF CALC'D POSTICA 22022 JEFFERSON STREET SE S8614'38'E 21.24 - N85'53'19'E - 42.44 PND 2" BRASS DISK-IN KORUN'ENT CASE 0.1" W. OF KIDHUMENT LINE. PAD Z" BTACS DISC N JOHLANDIT CASE -HELD TO CONTROL THIS SURVEY. PIO 2" BRASS DISK IN MONIMENT CASE HELD TO CONTROL THIS SURVEY. FND 2" BRASS DSK-IR MONIAGHT CASE T CALCULATED POSITION. PAD 2" BRISS DISK—
N MONUMBIT CASE
N. OF MONUMBIT LINE HNO 2" BRASS DISK IN-MONUMENT CASE HELD TO CONTROL THIS SURVEY.

4243334 PAGE 3 OF 3 IZ/ZI/ZO11 O4:10 PM Thurston County WA

ARE PAGE 3 OF 3 IZ/ZI/ZO11 O4:10 PM Thurston County WA

ARE PAGE 3 OF 3 IZ/ZI/ZO11 O4:10 PM Thurston County WA

ARE PAGE 3 OF 3 IZ/ZI/ZO11 O4:10 PM Thurston County WA

ARE PAGE 3 OF 3 IZ/ZI/ZO11 O4:10 PM Thurston County WA

ARE PAGE 3 OF 3 IZ/ZI/ZO11 O4:10 PM Thurston County WA

ARE PAGE 3 OF 3 IZ/ZI/ZO11 O4:10 PM Thurston County WA

ARE PAGE 3 OF 3 IZ/ZI/ZO11 O4:10 PM Thurston County WA

ARE PAGE 3 OF 3 IZ/ZI/ZO11 O4:10 PM Thurston County WA

ARE PAGE 3 OF 3 IZ/ZI/ZO11 O4:10 PM Thurston County WA

ARE PAGE 3 OF 3 IZ/ZI/ZO11 O4:10 PM Thurston County WA

ARE PAGE 3 OF 3 IZ/ZI/ZO11 O4:10 PM Thurston County WA

ARE PAGE 3 OF 3 IZ/ZI/ZO11 O4:10 PM Thurston County WA

ARE PAGE 3 OF 3 IZ/ZI/ZO11 O4:10 PM Thurston County WA

ARE PAGE 3 OF 3 IZ/ZI/ZO11 O4:10 PM Thurston County WA

ARE PAGE 3 OF 3 IZ/ZI/ZO11 O4:10 PM Thurston County WA

ARE PAGE 3 OF 3 IZ/ZI/ZO11 O4:10 PM Thurston County WA

ARE PAGE 3 OF 3 IZ/ZI/ZO11 O4:10 PM Thurston County WA

ARE PAGE 3 OF 3 IZ/ZI/ZO11 O4:10 PM Thurston County WA

ARE PAGE 3 OF 3 IZ/ZI/ZO11 O4:10 PM Thurston County WA

ARE PAGE 3 OF 3 IZ/ZI/ZO11 O4:10 PM Thurston County WA

ARE PAGE 3 OF 3 IZ/ZI/ZO11 O4:10 PM Thurston County WA

ARE PAGE 3 OF 3 IZ/ZI/ZO11 O4:10 PM Thurston County WA

ARE PAGE 3 OF 3 IZ/ZI/ZO11 O4:10 PM Thurston County WA

ARE PAGE 3 OF 3 IZ/ZI/ZO11 O4:10 PM Thurston County WA

ARE PAGE 3 OF 3 IZ/ZI/ZO11 O4:10 PM Thurston County WA

ARE PAGE 3 OF 3 IZ/ZI/ZO11 O4:10 PM Thurston County WA

ARE PAGE 3 OF 3 IZ/ZI/ZO11 O4:10 PM Thurston County WA

ARE PAGE 3 OF 3 IZ/ZI/ZO11 O4:10 PM Thurston County WA

ARE PAGE 3 OF 3 IZ/ZI/ZO11 O4:10 PM Thurston County WA

ARE PAGE 3 OF 3 IZ/ZI/ZO11 O4:10 PM Thurston County WA

ARE PAGE 3 OF 3 IZ/ZI/ZO11 O4:10 PM Thurston County WA

ARE PAGE 3 OF 3 IZ/ZI/ZO11 O4:10 PM Thurston County WA

ARE PAGE 3 OF 3 IZ/ZI/ZO11 O4:10 PM Thurston County WA

ARE PAGE 3 OF 3 IZ/ZI/ZO11 O4:10 PM Thurston County WA

ARE PAGE 3 OF 3 IZ/ZI/ZO11 O4:10 PM Thurston County WA

ARE PAGE 3 OF 3 IZ/ZI/ZO11

COURT OF APPEALS

DIVISION II

2016 OCT 10 AM 10: 10

STATE OF WASHINGTON

No. 48744-6-II

Court of Appeals, Div. II, of the State of Washington

Steve Berschauer,

Appellant,

v.

State of Washington, Department of Enterprise Services, et al.

Respondents

### Certificate of Service

W. Dale Kamerrer Attorney for Respondent City of Olympia

Law, Lyman, Daniel, Kamerrer & Bogdanovich, P.S. P.O. Box 11880 Olympia, WA 98508 (360) 754-3480 WSBA No. 8218

Mark Barber Attorney for Respondent City of Olympia

P.O. Box 1967/601 - 4<sup>th</sup> Ave. E. Olympia, WA 98507-8338 (360) 753-8338 WSBA No. 8379

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of Washington that on the date specified below, I served upon counsel a copy of the following documents via U.S. Mail, postage pre-paid as follows:

- 1. (Substitute) Brief of Respondent City of Olympia;
- 2. Certificate of Service.

### to the following:

Jon E. Cushamn Kevin Hochhalter Cushman Law Offices 924 Capitol Way South Olympia, WA 98501

Mark Barber, City Attorney City of Olympia P.O. Box 1967 Olympia, WA 98507

Michael R. Scott Hillis Clark Martin & Peterson PS 999 Third Avenue, Suite 4600 Seattle, WA 98104

Courtney Seim Riddell Williams PS 1001 Fourth Avenue, Suite 4500 Seattle, WA 98154

Brian Faller Washington State Attorney General's Office P.O. Box 40108 Olympia, WA 98504

Dated this \_\_\_\_\_ day of October 2016 at Tumwater, Washington.

Marry Marze
Legal Assistant to W. Dale Kamerrer